DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 587 CG 024 405

AUTHOR Lemke, Lynn A.; And Others
TITLE Differences in Social Support between Rural and Urban Communities.
PUB DATE Aug 92
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (100th, Washington, DC, August 14-18, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adults; Helping Relationship; Interpersonal Relationship; *Rural Urban Differences; Sex Differences; *Social Support Groups

ABSTRACT

Traditionally, a "rural" community refers to a community with low population density, which is relatively isolated from a metropolitan area, and which is economically based around the agriculture industry. This is in contrast to the "urban" community, which refers to a community with high population density or to one that is contained within or adjacent to a metropolitan center, with the economy based on a variety of industries. This study examined differences in the social support systems of men and women in urban and rural communities. Specific variables related to social support systems which served as the focus for the study included: wanted and expressed inclusion, control, and affection; the amount of affection, affirmation, and material aid received; and the longevity of relationships, the frequency of contact, and the total number of people in the social support system. Males (N=40) and females (N=40) from a rural midwest setting and males (N=40) and females (N=40) from an urban midwest setting were assessed on these variables using the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior instrument (FIRO-B) and the Norbeck Social Support Questionnaire. The results indicated significant urban/rural differences related to wanted and expressed inclusion and frequency of contact with the social support system. Significant gender differences were found for the expressed control and the longevity of the relationships. No significant gender by setting interactional effects were found for any of the variables. (Author/ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DIFFERENCES IN SOCIAL SUPPORT BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN COMMUNITIES

ED349587

Lynn A. Lemke

Shawnee Mission Medical Center

and

James W. Lichtenberg Barrie Mariner Arachtingi

University of Kansas

Running head: Social support

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, August, 1992, Washington, DC.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James W Lichtenberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CG024405

Abstract

This study examined differences in the social support systems of men and women in and urban and rural communities. Specific variables related to social support systems which served as the focus for the study included: wanted and expressed inclusion, control, and affection, and the amount of affection, affirmation, material aid, the longevity of relationships, the frequency of contact, and the total number of people in the social support system. Forty males and 40 females from a rural midwest setting and 40 males and 40 females from an urban midwest setting were assessed on these variables using the FIRO-B and Norbeck Social Support Questionnaire. The results indicated significant urban/rural differences related to wanted and expressed inclusion and frequency of contact with the social support system. Significant gender differences were found for the expressed control and the longevity of the relationships. No significant gender by setting interactional effects were found for any of the variables.

DIFFERENCES IN SOCIAL SUPPORT BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN COMMUNITIES

The purpose of this study was to examine possible differences in the social support systems of rural and urban communities. Specifically, the study looked at differences between urban and rural residents in terms of their need for and expression of inclusion, control, and affection, the number of people in their support system, the amount of affection available in their support system, the amount of affirmation available, the amount of material aid available, the longevity of their relationships in the support system, and the frequency of contact with the members of the support system. The study also looked at the differences between men and women on these variables in both the urban and rural communities.

Traditionally, a "rural" community refers to a community with low population density, which is relatively isolated from a metropolitan area, and which is economically based around the agriculture industry (Whitaker, 1983). This is in contrast to the "urban" community, which refers to a community with high population density or contained within or adjacent to a metropolitan center, with the economy based on a variety of industries.

The specific parameters on which rural and urban populations are distinguished, however, vary with different studies. For example, rural communities have been distinguished based on census standards as any community with fewer than 2500 residents, or communities not included in or adjacent to an urban area is a rural community (Whitaker, 1983). Population density has been another of the parameters used to make urban/rural distinctions. Relatedly, the United States Department of Agriculture developed a ten category classification system in which counties were classified as either metropolitan or non-metropolitan [sic rural] using the parameter of population density as the primary criterion (Hines, Brown & Zimmer, 1970).

Socio-cultural factors also have been used to define rural and urban communities. Dewey (1960) identified five factors which differed with population variations: anonymity, division of labor,

heterogeneity, impersonal and formally prescribed relationships, symbols of status which are independent on personal acquaintance. Anonymity is a result of contact with masses of people that occurs in urban communities and is almost impossible in rural communities, where contact with a variety of individuals is more restricted. The difference in the division of labor increases as the size and density of the community increases. The heterogeneity of the larger urban communities is again a result of the size and density of the community. The greater the size of the community the greater heterogeneity that is going to exists within the community. The number of relationships available to individuals in urban communities demands that these relationships have more structure and be less personal than those found in rural communities. The urban community demands more explicit and formal social rules to guide society than the rural community needs. When people interact socially with people whom they do not know, it demands some means of identifying the functions of these people. These same functions are simply known by individuals in rural communities.

Wirth (1938) defined an urban society as a large population of heterogeneous individuals with vast differences, and noted that cities typically have been a melting-pot of races, people and cultures. He also noted that the increase in the number of individuals in an urban community creates a greater potential for differentiation between them; and the range of personal traits, occupations, cultural life, and ideas found in an urban community can be expected to vary widely from that found in a rural community. In contrast to rural communities, urban communities in fact have rewarded differences in their population as these differences have met the needs of other groups.

The place and nature of work, income, racial and ethnic characteristics, social status, customs, habits, tastes, preferences, and prejudices are among the factors which affect urban development (Wirth, 1938). Diverse population elements inhabiting compact areas tend to become segregated from one another by their modes of life. Different parts of urban areas tend to require different specialized functions with abrupt transitions between areas.

Urban populations also generally are believed to contain a larger proportion of persons in the prime of their life than rural areas, which contain more old and very young people (Wirth, 1938).

They also contain more ethnic and racial groups and more foreign born residents and their children. Generally, the larger the urban area, the more prevalent the racial groups. In summary, then, one major characteristics of urban residents is the dissimilarity among them.

Although few Americans are actually classified as rural, a significant proportion of adults have rural backgrounds. Glenn and Hill (1977) have estimated that around half of today's elderly have rural backgrounds, and that about one-fourth of today's young adults have rural backgrounds. In looking at these proportions, it is possible that any study examining rural-urban differences may be affected by the rural backgrounds of the urban sample. But if personality is affected by the environment as suggested, then even those individuals of rural backgrounds will be influenced by the communities in which they are currently living.

During the 1980's, rural communities went through serious financial crises resulting in several significant trends. The farm population suffered a drop of 7% to 5.3 million in 1985 (Hoffman, 1988). An estimated 240,000 Americans stopped farming in 1987, dropping the country's farm population to its lowest level since before the Civil War. Although the decline in the farm population in 1987 was not statistically significant, the accumulated annual changes in the farm population through the 1980's has been a significant average decline of 2.5% per year (Hoffman, 1989).

The median income for farm families in 1985 was $18,925, only three-fourths that of non-farm families (Hoffman, 1988). Although inflation had increased the assets of farmers, the increasing profitability of farming declined significantly in the early 1980's. Farmers were faced with low foreign demand for grain, increasing costs, high interest rates, and rapidly decreasing land values. Cash flow and profitability became a major concern for farmers in the 1980's. The greatest pressure fell upon the middle-sized family operated farms (Farmer, 1986). Many of these families fought tenaciously to retain their family farms, in many cases beyond the point of reasonable hope.

The losses of farms generally took place over several years for most farm families. The result was that farm families were subjected to prolonged and chronic stress. Many farmers found it difficult to cope with these losses and often withdrew socially. They stopped attending church and started

avoiding school and community activities (Farmer, 1986). These changes in behavior took them away from their traditional sources of support. These social behavior changes resulted in a shift from informal support systems (family, friends, and neighbors) to formal support services found in community mental health centers and regional health centers.

Social support has been shown to have a buffering effect against stress (Cobb, 1976). Cobb has defined social support as the information leading individuals to believe they are cared for, loved, esteemed, valued, or belonging to a support network. Bruhn and Phillips (1984, p.165-166) identified twelve characteristics of social support:

1. Social support is dynamic with its form and quantity varying with time.
2. Social support has interactive, qualitative, and quantitative dimensions that need to be considered simultaneously.
3. If an individual does not perceive that social support is available, it can not be used.
4. The need for social support changes according to life situation.
5. Social support is a facet of everyday life, although the need for it may be more acute in times of stress, it does not disappear when not needed.
6. Changes in the physical, psychological, and social functioning of individuals can effect their perception of the need and availability of social support.
7. Social support is a characteristic of individuals, groups, and communities and cannot be fully understood assessing it at any one of these levels alone.
8. Social support is not a single phenomenon but it is a cluster of factors that act together (usually with a positive effect).
9. Social support can have positive and negative effects. Too little social support can inhibit motivation and initiative; too much support can stifle creativity and spontaneity.
10. Social support can be general or specialized. Some aspects of support (a closely knit family or a religious belief) may be a general characteristic or an enduring aspect of an individual's life, but when a crisis occurs, the individual may call upon specialized support (a counselor). Individuals can receive support from one or more generalized and specialized sources at the same time.
11. Social support exists in various forms in different cultures.
12. In studying social support, it is not sufficient to determine only whether it is present and in what amounts, but how it works.

Shumaker and Brownell (1984, p.14-15) have defined 3 functions of social support that impact social support research.

1. Gratification of affiliative needs - needs for contact and companionship of others, feeling of belonging, expression of caring, love understanding, concern, intimacy.
2. Self identity maintenance and enhancement - acquire awareness of our social selves and clarify beliefs.
3. Self-esteem enhancement - learning who we are, validate a person's sense of value and adequacy, affirmation of worth, approval, praise, respect.

Social support may be defined both objectively and subjectively. Objectively, one can count the social activities and social contacts; however, not every contact or activity will supply the same amount of support. At the same time, evaluating social support subjectively, in terms of one's feelings of being cared for, loved, or wanted by others necessitates evaluating support in terms of frequency and availability.

It is assumed that the greater the social support received in terms of both quality and quantity, the greater one's ability to cope with psychological distress (Schultz & Saklofske, 1983). In this regard, social support has a mediating factor in determining an individual's response to the external environment. It protects an individual from distressing life events, extends coping resources, and facilitates adaptation.

Barrera and Ainlay (1983) have noted that social support may be provided in several several different ways. Support may come in the form of material aid, such as money or other physical objects. It may also be behavioral assistance by sharing in life's tasks through intimate interactions that include listening, expressions of esteem, caring, and understanding, as well as guidance, advice, information and instruction. Social support may also come through feedback about behavior, thoughts, or feelings. It also may be present in positive social interactions for fun and relaxation, or in specific acts to prevent the unfortunate consequences of crisis and change (Cobb, 1976).

There seems to be little question that the separation of rural individuals from their support system by population shifts or by isolative behavior has resulted in greater stress on rural families. Withdrawal from their typical social activities has removed the sources of support most generally available to them. This stress may be exacerbated by the rural families' transition to the urban community, especially to the extent that differences exist in the social support systems of rural and urban communities.

In light of these changes, moves, and transitions, this study examined possible differences that might exist between the social support systems of the urban and rural communities. It was believed

that knowledge of these differences, if they exist, could be an aid to counselors and other helping professionals in assisting people to adjust to different communities and to develop new support systems.

Method

Subjects

Urban sample. The urban sample consisted of 80 individuals, 40 males and 40 females. The sample was drawn from Shawnee Mission and Overland Park, Kansas. Both communities are located in the state of Kansas and are suburbs of Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas. Together they have a combined population of approximately 250,000. The average age of the urban female sample was 40.24 years of age with a range from 21 to 67 years (SD=11.86). The urban male sample averaged 52.92 years of age, with a range of 31 to 77 years (SD=14.59).

Rural sample. The rural sample also consisted of 80 individuals, 40 males and 40 females. The rural sample was drawn from the community of Paola, Kansas. Paola, the county seat of Miami county, has a population of 4557. Paola is located 25 miles south of the nearest urban area. Paola's economy is based on a diversified agricultural base of wheat, corn, sorghum, soybeans, milk production, beef, and pork. The average age of the rural female sample was 42.06, with a range from 29 to 65 years (SD=9.95). The rural male sample averaged 46.22 years of age with a range of 25 to 75 years (SD=13.55).

In order to be included in the study, participants in either sample needed to be over the age of 18 years old and to have lived at their current address for a minimum of one year.

Instruments

Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation- Behavior (FIRO-B; Schutz, 1978). This instrument was used to measure the subjects' characteristic behavior toward other people in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. The theory underlying the FIRO-B is that all human interactions may be organized around three categories of issues: issues surrounding inclusion, issues surrounding control, and issues surrounding affection (Schutz, 1978). These three interpersonal issues are measured in two behavioral directions: behavior which is expressed toward others and behavior which is wanted from

others (Schutz, 1978). Each of the three issues is assessed in terms of both its positive and negative behavioral aspects.

The Inclusion scale of the FIRO-B indicates wanted or expressed behavior which implies the following positive aspects: association, interaction, communication, belonging, companionship, camaraderie, membership, togetherness, extroversion or interest. The negative aspects of inclusion would be seen as: exclusion, isolation, outcast, loneliness, detachment, withdrawn, or abandonment.

The Control scale measures wanted and expressed control in relationships indicated by the positive aspects of: power, authority, dominance, influence, control, ruler, superior, officer, or leader. The negative aspects of control would be: rebellion, resistance, follower, anarchy, submissive.

The Affection scale measures wanted and expressed affection indicated by the positive terms: love, like, emotional closeness, personal, intimate, friend, sweetheart. The negative aspects of affection would be: hate, coolness, dislike, emotionally distant, rejection.

The FIRO-B has demonstrated good reliability. The reproducibility of scores on the six scales has a mean .94 (Schutz, 1978). Schutz (1978) states that the scores show good internal consistency, and he reports the test-retest mean coefficient to be .76 after a one-month period.

Norbeck Social Support Questionnaire (NSSQ; Norbeck, Lindsey, & Carrieri,1981). The NSSQ was used to measure five characteristics of social support: affection, affirmation, material aid, frequency of contact, and longevity. Kahn (1979) defined social support as interpersonal interactions that include: expressions of affection, affirmation or endorsement of another person, giving of material aid to another.

The test-retest reliabilities of the NSSQ scales show correlations of .85 to .92 with the retest one week later. The internal consistency between similar items showed correlations of .95 to .98. The concurrent validity of the NSSQ has been examined by comparing the NSSQ with the Social Support Questionnaire of Cohen and Lazarus (Norbeck et al., 1981).

Procedure

For both the urban and rural samples, subjects were randomly selected from the telephone directories of their respective communities. A random line and column of the telephone book was selected and then each person on that line and column on every page was called until the required sample size was reached. The nature of the calls was to solicit participation in the study. Individuals agreeing over the phone to participate were sent packets containing copies of the FIRO-B and NSSQ, along with a self-addressed stamped envelope for return of the materials to the experimenters. In order to secure 40 subjects from each group, 84 questionnaires were sent out to get 40 returned questionnaires from the rural male group; 68 questionnaires were sent to the urban male group; and 55 questionnaires were sent to both the urban and rural female groups. Phone calls were made to 1572 people to request permission to send out the 262 questionnaires.

Of the questionnaires returned, two were not used. One subject returned the NSSQ but failed to return the FIRO-B; another subject failed to properly answer the NSSQ.

Analyses

A series of 2 (urban/rural) x 2 (male/female) MANOVAs was used to examine (a) the wanted and expressed scales of the FIRO-B on each of its three dimensions of Inclusion, Control, and Affection, and (b) the NSSQ's scales of Affection, Affirmation, and Material Aid. Data were analyzed to allow for an examination of the differences between urban and rural communities, male and female subjects, and of any possible interactional effects. Significant multivariate F's were examined using ANOVA procedures.

Separate 2 (urban/rural) x 2 (male/female) ANOVAs were run on the NSSQ's scales of Total individuals listed, Longevity and Frequency of contact. Finally, Pearson correlations to investigate the intercorrelations of the various scales.

Results

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the means and standard deviations for each of the scales of the FIRO-B by setting (urban/rural) and by sex (male/female).

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

The 2 x 2 MANOVA of the FIRO-B's Inclusion scales (Wanted and Expressed) revealed a significant difference by setting, $F(2,155)=7.46$, $p<.01$. No effect was found for gender, $F(2,155)=2.55$, NS; and no setting by gender interactional effect was found, $F(2,155)=.14$, NS. Post hoc analyses revealed a significant difference between the urban and rural samples on both the Expressed Inclusion scale, $F(1,156)=9.56$, $p<.01$, and the Wanted Inclusion scale, $F(1,156)=13.76$, $p<.01$. As noted in Table 1, the urban sample showed a greater desire for inclusion than did the rural sample ($\underline{M}_U=3.30$ vs. $\underline{M}_R=1.53$), as well as a greater expression of inclusion ($\underline{M}_U=3.84$ vs. $\underline{M}_R=2.78$).

The 2 x 2 MANOVA of the FIRO-B Control scales (Wanted and Expressed) revealed no significant difference by setting $F(2, 155)=.77$, NS. A significant difference was found by gender, $F(2,155)=3.33$, $p<.05$, but no significant gender by setting interaction effect was found, $F(2,155)=2.03$, NS. Post hoc ANOVAs revealed a significant gender difference for the Expressed Control scale, $F(1,155)=5.34$, $p<.05$, with males expressing more control ($M=2.75$) than women ($M=1.84$,). No significant difference was found for the Wanted Control scale, $F(1,155)=1.71$, NS.

The 2 x 2 MANOVA of the FIRO-B Affection scales (Wanted and Expressed) revealed no significant effects for setting, $F(2,155)=1.98$, NS, gender, $F(2,155)=1.32$, NS, or for setting by gender interaction, $F(2,155)=.69$, NS; consequently, no follow-up analyses were conducted on these variables.

Tables 3 and 4 summarize the means and standard deviations for each of the scales of the NSSQ by setting (urban/rural) and by sex (male/female).

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

The 2 x 2 MANOVA of the NSSQ scales of Affection, Affirmation, and Material Aid revealed no significant differences according to setting $F(3, 154)=.07$, NS, gender, $F(3,154)=2.28$, or gender by

setting interaction, F(3,154)=.21, NS; consequently, no follow-up analyses were conducted on these variables.

The 2 x 2 ANOVA on the Total Number of the Individuals Listed scale of the NSSQ found no significant differences according to setting F(1,156)=.72, NS, gender F(1,156)=2.70, NS, or gender by setting interaction, F(1,156)=.01, NS.

A similar 2 x 2 ANOVA on the Longevity of the Relationships scale of the NSSQ found no significant difference for the setting variable F(1,156)=1.22, NS, or for the gender by setting interaction, F(1,156)=.42, NS. However, the analysis did reveal a significant difference according by gender for this variable, F(1,156)=3.96, $p<.05$, with men indicating that they had know their support person longer than the women ($\underline{M}_M$=4.81 vs. $\underline{M}_F$=4.69).

The final 2 x 2 ANOVA on the Frequency of Contact scale of the NSSQ revealed a significant difference between the urban ($\underline{M}_U$=3.71) and rural ($\underline{M}_R$=3.96) settings, F(1,156)=5.99, $p<.05$, but no significant differences for gender, F(1,156)=1.08, NS, or for the gender by setting interaction, F(1,156)=1.52, NS.

Table 5 summarizes the intercorrelations among the various FIRO-B and NSSQ variables, and reveals that the individual subscales of both the FIRO-B and NSSQ instruments were much more strongly correlated with other subscales of the same instrument than they were with the subscales of the other instrument.

Insert Table 5 about here

Discussion

It was hypothesized that the rural subjects would demonstrate more behavior directed to wanting and expressing inclusion due to the isolation of the rural community. The inclusion scale implied interaction, communication, companionship, membership, and/or association. The sample groups studied revealed a significant difference by setting for the wanted inclusion and expressed inclusion scales on the FIRO-B. When examining the scores for the urban and rural samples, it was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

found that the urban sample expressed significantly more inclusion for both the male and female samples. This was also true with respect to wanted inclusion; both the males and females of the urban sample had significantly higher scores than their rural counterparts. Scores might indeed reflect that those in a rural setting have less need to move toward others for they may perceive themselves as an integral part of the community.

This finding fits well with the expectation that rural individuals would be more isolated than those in a urban setting. This lack of inclusion could be seen as exclusion, detachment, abandonment, and isolation. However, this finding does not fit with Wirth's (1938) expectation that the rural community would have more primary relationships and the urban sample would have less need for primary relationships with the increase of secondary relationships and a high level of stimulation. Despite the urban sample's greater availability to people, they also expressed and wanted more inclusion than did the more isolated rural samples. The differences found on the inclusion scales support what Miller and Crader (1979) have suggested, that the type of community individuals choose to live in results in a selection of behavioral choices for social supportive behaviors. It also supports Youmans (1977) conclusion that rural residents have fewer interpersonal contacts.

No gender differences and no gender by setting interactional effects for the Inclusion scales of the FIRO-B were found. The only differences found for expressed and wanted inclusion were a function of the rural/urban setting difference.

No significant differences for gender, setting, or gender by setting interactions were found for the Affection Expressed and Affection Wanted scales. The lack of difference in the Affection scale would appear to differ from what was predicted by Toennes (1957) and by Wirth (1938). Toennes' (1957) concept of "Gemeinschaft" suggested that the rural community would be characterized by family and friendship relationships with a sense of commitment and mutuality. The urban community relationships, "Gesellshaft," would be characterized as an means to an end with less emphasis on emotional content. Wirth (1938) presented the urban community as having a greater differentiation between individuals and relationships having less personal closeness due to the greater segmentation of

the roles in the urban community. Again, this study found no measurable difference in terms of affection between the two communities. The analysis of the NSSQ's Affection scale supported the findings from both of the Affection scales on the FIRO-B.

Affection is one of the key factors contained in social support (Cobb, 1976; Shumaker & Brownell, 1984; Barrera & Ainlay, 1983; Caplan, 1974). The lack of significant difference on this key construct of social support suggests, at least in part, that no differences exist in this aspect of the social support system of rural and urban communities.

No significant differences were found to exist for the Affirmation and Material Aid scales for the NSSQ. The lack of difference would appear contrary to what would have been expected by Wirth (1938). Wirth's logic suggested the differentiation of roles and the replacement of the primary relationships with secondary relationships in the urban community might be expected to lead to a difference between the rural and urban communities on the Affirmation and Material Aid variables.

Affirmation and material aid are important concepts in social support theory (Cobb, 1976; Shumaker & Brownell, 1984; Barrera & Ainlay, 1983; Webster, 1984). In fact, the similarity of the weighted mean scores would appear to say that the support systems are very similar.

The similarity of the urban and rural communities on material aid also is different than would be expected from the studies examining helping behavior in urban and rural communities. The lack of difference in the Material Aid scale appears contrary to the findings of Steblay (1987) which indicated a difference for helping behavior in urban and rural communities.

The analysis of the Longevity of the Relationships scale on the NSSQ revealed a significant difference by gender, but no significant difference for setting or for gender by setting. From an examination of the mean scores on the longevity of relationships variable, it appears that the male sample had known their support system for a longer period of time than did the female sample.

The lack of difference according to setting would negate any expected difference in the effectiveness of the support system according to longevity. Schultz & Saklofske (1983) found relationships with greater longevity to have increased trust and greater influence. The lack of

difference here would also appear contrary to the expected findings according to Wirth (1938). Wirth stated that the distinctive features of the urban community were: (a) a replacement of primary relationships with secondary relationships; (b) a weakening of the bonds of family, friends and neighbors; (c) a decline in the significance of the family; (d) the destruction of the sense of community; (e) and the loss of the traditional sense of community.

The lack of any significant longevity difference would appear to indicate that the urban community has either maintained the importance of the primary relationships or that the rural communities do not have significantly different longevity of relationships than the urban community. The accessibility to greater resources has not diminished the importance of the primary relationships.

With regards to the frequency of contact variable on the NSSQ, the means suggest that the rural setting had greater frequency of contact with their social support system than did the urban sample. The greater frequency of contact of the rural sample would not have been what would have been expected due to the greater isolation of the rural community. The more frequent contact with the support group would appear to contradict the rural subjects lower scores on the Inclusion (Wanted and Expressed) scales. The more frequent contact of the rural subjects would be consistent with Wirth's (1938) theory that the primary relationships were of less importance to the urban community due to the greater number of resources that are available to the urban resident. The urban community also comes in contact with a greater number of divergent groups which each have their own messages. The urban resident also receives less influence from the extended family in the areas of vocational, educational, religious, recreational, and political interests. The less frequent contact of the urban subjects would also be consistent with the findings of Scott and Roberto (1985). They stated that the urban community placed more emphasis on economic and cultural values and that the rural community placed greater emphasis on family and community values. The greater economic and cultural opportunities of the urban community result in less emphasis on family values and could be predicted to result in less contact with their social support system.

The lack of significant difference among the samples on the Total Number of People Listed variable was not expected. It was assumed that the isolation of the rural community would result in the size of the social support group being smaller than the urban community. This lack of difference would be consistent with Wirth (1938) who predicted that the constant state of interaction experienced by urban residents would result in greater segmentation of relationships in the urban community. The urban resident may have more contact with a greater number of people, however, these contacts may be less significant than the fewer contacts of the rural resident. This lack of difference may also be explained by the findings of Korte (1980) who found that rural residents were much more likely to visit neighbors or friends than were the urban residents.

The research has shown the urban subjects demonstrated more expressed and wanted inclusive behavior than the rural subjects. This finding may reflect the fact that the urban community provides more social contact for the urban subjects. The research has also noted that the rural subjects have more frequent contact with their social support system. This would appear to imply that the urban subjects may have more of their social needs met through contact with others not included in their social support system. The increased contact of the rural subjects with their social support system implies that the social needs are more frequently met through the social support system than through contact with secondary relationships.

This evidence suggests that the clients with rural backgrounds may tend to seek out support from their social support system more directly than urban clients. The implication here is that counselors and helping professionals may be able to tap into this natural resource of rural clients by seeking support from their established support system. The rural clients may need help in expanding their awareness of new resources available to them in their new environments, especially where previous support systems are no longer available.

The lack of difference on the Affection, Affirmation and Material Aid scales suggests that the urban and rural clients social support system is very similar. The similarity of the social support system implies that clients, no matter what setting in which they may live or may have come from, get

the same affection, affirmation and material aid from their support systems. Therefore, helping professionals may use similar strategies for accessing this support for clients.

References

Barrera, M. J. & Ainlay, S. L. (1983). The structure of social support: A conceptual and empirical analysis. Journal of Community Psychology, 11, 133-143.

Bruhn, J. G., & Phillips, B. U. (1984). Measuring social support: A synthesis of current approaches. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 7, 151-169.

Caplan, G. (1974). Support systems and community mental health: Lectures on concept development. New York: Behavioral Publications.

Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. Psychosomatic Medicine, 38, 300-314.

Dewey, R. (1960). The rural-urban continuum: Real but relatively unimportant. The American Journal of Sociology, 66, 60-67.

Farmer, Val. (1986). Broken heartland. Psychology Today, April, 54-62.

Garfield, C. A. (Ed.). (1979). Stress and survival: The emotional realities of life-threatening illness. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.

Glenn, N. D. & Hill, L. (1977). Rural-urban differences in attitudes and behavior in the United States. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 429, 36-50.

Hines, F. K., Brown, D. L., & Zimmer, J. M. (1975). Social and economic characteristics of the population in metro and nonmetro counties, 1970. U.S. Department of Agriculture Agricultural Economic Report No. 272, Economic Research Services.

Hoffman, Mark S. (Ed.). (1988). The World Almanac and Book of Facts. New York: World Almanac.

Hoffman, Mark S. (Ed.). (1989). The World Almanac and Book of Facts. New York: World Almanac.

Norbeck, J. S., Lindsey, A. M., & Carrieri, V. L. (1981). The development of an instrument to measure social support. Journal of Nursing Research, 30, 264-269.

Schultz, B. J., & Saklofske, D. H. (1983). Relationship between social support and selected measures of psychological well-being. Psychological Reports, 53, 847-850.

Schutz, Will. (1978). FIRO Awareness Scales Manual. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Shumaker, S. A., & Brownell, A. (1984). Towards a theory of social support: Closing the conceptual gap. Journal of Social Issues, 40, 11-36.

Toennes, F. (1957). Gemeinschaft and gesellschaft. New York: Harper & Row.

Webster, S. (1984). Rural helping systems. Human Services in the Rural Environment, 9, 1984.

Whitaker, W. H. (1983). Conceptualizing "rural" for research in education: A sociological perspective. Rural Education, 1, 71-76.

Wirth, L. (1938). Urbanism as a way of life. The American Journal of Sociology, 44, 1-24.

Youmans, E. G. (1977). The rural aged. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 429, 81-90.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for the FIRO-B Scales by Urban/Rural Setting

Scale	Group											
	Urban						Rural					
	Male		Female		Total		Male		Female		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Inclusion Wanted	2.78	3.63	3.83	3.34	3.30	3.51	1.25	2.20	1.80	2.72	1.53	2.48
Inclusion Expressed	3.40	2.09	4.28	2.08	3.84	2.11	2.24	2.17	3.10	2.35	2.78	2.27
Control Wanted	2.98	2.11	3.78	2.24	3.38	2.20	2.95	2.25	3.05	2.10	3.00	2.16
Control Expressed	2.53	2.94	2.28	2.54	3.41	2.19	2.98	2.56	1.40	1.81	2.96	2.17
Affection Wanted	5.15	2.23	5.05	2.45	4.90	2.16	3.98	2.75	4.75	1.85	4.56	2.55
Affection Expressed	3.05	1.95	3.35	2.53	3.20	2.25	3.03	2.05	3.23	1.89	2.85	1.82

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of FIRO-B by Sex

	Sex			
Scale	Males		Females	
	M	SD	M	SD
Inclusion Wanted	2.01	3.08	2.81	3.19
Inclusion Expressed	2.93	2.17	3.69	2.28
Control Wanted	2.96	2.17	3.41	2.19
Control Expressed	2.75	2.75	1.84	2.24
Affection Wanted	4.56	2.56	4.90	2.16
Affection Expressed	2.76	1.84	3.29	2.22

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for the NSSQ Scales by Urban/Rural Setting

Scale	Group											
	Urban						Rural					
	Male		Female		Total		Male		Female		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Affect.	8.04	1.11	8.35	0.86	8.19	1.00	7.98	1.25	8.40	0.85	8.19	1.08
Affirm.	7.22	1.18	7.39	1.07	7.30	1.12	7.22	1.10	7.50	0.96	7.36	1.04
Mat. Aid.	7.51	1.54	7.23	1.37	7.37	1.46	7.38	1.52	7.44	1.29	7.41	1.40
Total	11.08	5.54	12.65	5.69	11.86	5.64	11.93	6.35	13.35	5.46	12.64	5.93
Longev.	4.82	0.33	4.74	0.30	4.78	0.31	4.74	0.37	4.64	0.45	4.72	0.42
Freq.	3.72	0.56	3.70	0.48	3.71	0.52	3.84	0.64	4.07	0.87	3.96	0.73

NOTE: Affect. = Affection
Affirm. = Affirmation
Mat. Aid = Material Aid
Total = Total
Longev. = Longevity
Freq. = Frequency

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for the NSSQ Scales by Sex

	Sex			
Scale	Males		Females	
	M	SD	M	SD
Affection	8.01	1.17	8.37	.85
Affirmation	7.22	1.14	7.44	1.01
Material Aid	7.44	1.52	7.33	1.33
Total	11.50	5.94	13.00	5.55
Longevity	4.81	.36	4.69	.38
Frequency	3.78	.55	3.89	.72

Table 5

Correlations Among the FIRO-B and NSSQ Scales

	FIRO-B Scales						NSSQ Scales					
	FIE	FIW	FCE	FCW	FAE	FAW	Affect	Affil	M-Aid	Total	Len	Freq
FIE	1.00											
FIW	.62	1.00										
FCE	.02	.02	1.00									
FCW	.17	.26	-.07	1.00								
FAE	.43	.44	-.03	.03	1.00							
FAW	.35	.49	.07	.01	.59	1.00						
Affect	-.07	.04	.00	-.07	-.07	-.17	1.00					
Affil	-.07	.02	.01	-.09	-.06	-.15	.96	1.00				
M-Aid	-.04	.01	-.03	.02	-.11	-.17	.90	.88	1.00			
Total	-.07	.01	.00	-.06	-.06	-.17	.96	.95	.89	1.00		
Len	-.05	.03	.00	-.05	-.07	-.16	.96	.95	.89	.99	1.00	
Freq	-.10	-.02	-.01	-.06	-.11	-.13	.90	.89	.86	.92	.90	1.00